

the hysteria and the charges and the warnings of the catastrophe, oh, the environmental catastrophe that would happen; and the caribous were going to quit breeding and all of those other dire consequences we would face. None of them came true.

But do my colleagues know what happened? We won that vote by 1 vote, 1 vote in the Senate. Because we had that pipeline, America has received 25 percent of its oil, domestic oil production through that pipeline. If we had not had that oil, our people would have lived at a much lower standard of living, we would not have been helped out during the crises that we faced.

What kind of crises are we going to face in the future? This 2 percent might help us out. We should make sure we can use it for the benefit of our people, keeping them prosperous and at peace.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has 1-3/4 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has 1 1/2 minutes remaining and has the right to close.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, a few hours ago we rejected the amendment to improve the CAFE standards, the mileage standards for automobiles. At that moment, this amendment ceased to be about America's energy supplies, America's energy independence, and America's national security, because at that moment, this House made a decision that it was going to continue to waste the oil products of this Nation, the finds of this Nation, the treasures of this Nation, to waste it on automobiles. Even though we have not made an improvement in 13 years, we voted to cave in to the automobile industry and not make those improvements.

This is not about our national security or our national energy; this is about a value. This is about a value, whether we are going to invade one of the most pristine and magnificent areas on the face of the Earth so that we can put it in automobiles to waste it.

The American public rejects that value and so should the Congress.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is about values. And in reading the inscription

from Daniel Webster, it did say we are responsible to promote all of its interests, all of the Nation's interests; and this is about the Nation's interest in preserving the environmental unique areas that we have inherited to pass them on to our children.

This is not about oil. Ninety-five percent of the North Slope is available for drilling. In Prudhoe Bay, there are well-known large reserves of gas. They could have drilled last year or the year before. They can drill the next year or the year thereafter.

Forty percent of our oil is used by transportation vehicles. All we have to do is raise the miles-per-gallon usage 3 miles to save much more than anyone thinks we will get out of this area of the ANWR.

So this is not about oil. This is about balance, this is about values. This is about a nation that is going to diversify its energy sources through exploration and renewable resources and preserve the environment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this, I say to my colleagues, is what the Arctic Refuge will look like if the Markey-Johnson amendment is not successful. The oil and gas industry has a bull's-eye that they have put in the middle of this sacred refuge that we should remove this evening.

This will be the most important environmental vote that we have. Do not allow the proponents of drilling in this refuge to convince us for a moment that, like Prudhoe Bay, the Arctic Refuge will not look like an industrial site, because it will. And this would be after a day in which our air conditioners and automobiles and every other device, that we could have voted to make more efficient so that we did not have to drill here.

But the majority said no. They say yes to the oil and gas industry and no to conservation and renewable energy and to energy efficiency.

Vote yes on the Markey-Johnson amendment and no to the oil and gas industry's design on this sacred wilderness in our country.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Markey-Johnson amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am against the amendment to ban drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve. DON YOUNG has said, "Oil exploration on Alaska's North slope is already the safest, cleanest, most environmentally responsible production in the world. If we say no to exploration in ANWR, we are saying yes to destructive methods that occur in other countries." I have been in this body for only seven months but I have worked with DON YOUNG and know he is a man of his word. We should respect his views on important matters within his district.

Failure to increase energy exploration in the United States will strengthen the OPEC cartel and taxes our constituents with higher fuel bills. We must work together to control our nation's destiny when it comes to meeting the future energy needs of our country.

U.S. demand for world oil is large, and we presently import over 50 percent of our oil. That is outrageous. One way to avoid this crippling dependence is to explore new domestic resources. As the Democrat Governor of Alaska has stated, "Opening [ANWR] for responsible oil and gas development is vital to the economic well being of Alaska and the nation." According to an analysis prepared by the Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates, ANWR development would create 735,000 new jobs, including 19,000 in my home state of Virginia.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time to close in opposition to the Markey amendment.

It is important at this stage that we set the record straight again. The map the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) showed us is not the Arctic Refuge. It is a map of section 1002. It is a map of a part of the Arctic Refuge, if you will, that was set aside in 1980 for exploration for minerals. It was specifically set aside for that purpose, and they said when Congress is ready, it will vote to open it up the same way we voted to do the pipeline.

The second thing that is erroneous about that map is that those pink lines represent, I guess, about 5-mile-wide highways, if that is what he is trying to represent.

The most important thing that is wrong about the map is that this House just voted, this House just voted to limit the footprint of any development to 2,000 acres, and it voted again to make sure that the Federal share of production, the dollars, would go back into conservation and alternative fuels, about \$1.25 billion according to CBO estimates.

So what we have done literally in this bill is to say that the 1980 set-aside can now be explored and developed for the good of this country. And we know that there is a 95 percent chance of 4 billion barrels of oil there, and it could be as high as 16 billion barrels of oil, the biggest find since Prudhoe Bay, and this country sorely needs it.

There was a time in American history when we decided two things, it was in our Revolutionary days. We decided we did not like government a whole lot, but we also decided if we had to have it, it would be better if we had our own instead of somebody else's. My colleagues may not like oil companies or oil, but it is a lot better if we produce it at home than depend upon Saddam Hussein.

Vote no on the Markey amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I believe that environmental opportunity and energy development can go hand in hand. That is why I offered the Jackson-Lee-Lampson amendment to H.R. 4, Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001. This